REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed August 5, 2005 for the above-identified patent application. Claims 1-8 are pending in the application and have been rejected.

The specification has been objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner states that the phrase "GPF", which is recited in claim 2, has not been defined in the specification. However, Applicants respectfully submit that "GPF" is a term well known in the art and, therefore, does not need to be described in detail in the specification. For example, Table 37 of Mantell discloses various Rubber-Grade Carbon Blacks, including general-purpose furnace (GPF) and super-abrasion furnace (SAF). *See* Charles L. Mantell, Carbon and Graphite Handbook chapter 6, pg. 78 (1968), the relevant portion of which is enclosed herewith. Applicants have also amended the specification, and claim 2, to clarify that GPF refers to general-purpose furnace grade and SAF refers to super-abrasion furnace.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the term "high" is a relative term that renders the claims indefinite.

Applicants have amended claims 3 and 7 to recite that 10 to 200 parts by weight of a process oil, based upon 100 parts by weight of the diene rubber are incorporated into the mixture. (*See, e.g.*, Specification pg. 10 lines 1-7). No new matter has been added.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1- 4 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,641 ("the '641 Patent") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,491,052 ("the '052 Patent"), EP 1 321 488 and WO 98/23653. The Examiner has also rejected claims 5- 8 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-7 of the '641 Patent further in view of the '052 Patent.

Applicants file herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) to overcome the rejections based on the judicially created doctrine of double patenting, to disclaim the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the above-identified application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,641. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that no additional fees are required in connection with this response. However, if additional fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional payment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Docket Number 100021.00136.**

Respectfully submitted,

Rochelle K. Seide

Rochelle K. Seide, Ph.D.
Registration No. 32,300
ARENT FOX PLLC
1675 Broadway
New York, NY 10019
Tel. No. (212) 484-3945
Fax No. (212) 484-3990
Customer No. 38485